



Docket No.: 198443US2

J. J. F.

OBLON
SPIVAK
McCLELLAND
MAIER
NEUSTADT
P.C.

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

RE: Application Serial No.: 09/737,742

Applicants: Tonnes BREKNE

Filing Date: December 18, 2000

For: ENCRYPTION OF PROGRAMS REPRESENTED AS
POLYNOMIAL MAPPINGS AND THEIR
COMPUTATIONS

Group Art Unit: 2132

Examiner: LANIER, B.

SIR:

Attached hereto for filing are the following papers:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Our check in the amount of **\$0.00** is attached covering any required fees. In the event any variance exists between the amount enclosed and the Patent Office charges for filing the above-noted documents, including any fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for any necessary Extension of Time to make the filing of the attached documents timely, please charge or credit the difference to our Deposit Account No. 15-0030. Further, if these papers are not considered timely filed, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 for the necessary extension of time. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.




Gregory J. Maier
Registration No. 25,599

Customer Number

22850

(703) 413-3000 (phone)
(703) 413-2220 (fax)

Michael R. Casey, Ph.D.
Registration No. 40,294



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF :
TONNES BREKNE : EXAMINER: LANIER, B.
SERIAL NO: 09/737,742 :
FILED: DECEMBER 18, 2000 : GROUP ART UNIT: 2132
FOR: ENCRYPTION OF PROGRAMS... :
1

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22313

SIR:

In response to the Restriction Requirement dated August 12, 2004, applicants provisionally elect with traverse Group VI, claims 24, 25 and 34-39. That Restriction Requirement asserts that the application contains claims to distinct inventions. However, MPEP § 803 states the following:


If the search and examination of an entire application can be made without serious burden, the Examiner must examine it on the merits, even though it includes claims to distinct or independent inventions.

The claims of the present invention would appear to be part of an overlapping search area. Accordingly, applicants respectfully traverse the Restriction Requirement on the grounds that a search and examination of the entire application would not place a *serious* burden on the examiner.

Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the requirement to elect a single group be withdrawn, and that a full examination on the merits of claims 1-67 be conducted.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599

Michael R. Casey, Ph.D.
Registration No. 40,294

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)